

Date: Fri, 4 Mar 94 00:39:53 PST
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V94 #233
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Fri, 4 Mar 94 Volume 94 : Issue 233

Today's Topics:

Amateur Radio Newsline #863 25 Feb 94
Have a say about ARRL policy
IMPORTANT - June VHF QSO Party
IPS Daily Report 25 02 94
MAC/WEFAX?????????
Medium range point-to-point digital links
Nude Radio Amateurs
On-line Repeater Directory
Yaesu FT2400H - Great radio.

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 3 Mar 1994 12:58:01 GMT
From: paperboy.ids.net!anomaly!kd1hz@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Amateur Radio Newsline #863 25 Feb 94
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

myers@cypress.West.Sun.COM (Dana Myers) writes:

> However, I do not believe 97.205(e) is the basis for civil action to
> prevent someone from using a particular frequency. In other words,
> if I want to prevent my repeater from repeating certain stations, either
> by manual or automatic means, I have that right. But litigating for a
> civil injunction goes way beyond limiting the use of my equipment.

> A horrible precedent.

I disagree completely. I applaude the decision.

As the trustee for a local 440mhz repeater, if I want someone off my machine, up to now the only recourse I have had is to ask them politely. If they continued to to operate "simplex" on my repeater input, well, golly, that was just too bad for me, huh?

Since there are dozens of CB scumballs who, unfortunately, with the declining price of dual-band radios, have decided to explore 440 (I guess it was inevitable), I welcome this precedent wholeheartly, as now I can easily, with the FCC's backing, keep the effluvia from overflowing onto my machine. Overall, the quality of life for the users of my machine is increased, as they don't have to deal with the aftermath of a poorly implemented nocode license on a daily basis.

MD

--

-- Michael P. Deignan, KD1HZ	-
-- Internet: kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com	- I never tell the truth, because I
-- UUCP: ...!uunet!anomaly!kd1hz	- I don't believe that there is such
-- AT&TNet: 401-273-4669	- a thing...

Date: Thu, 03 Mar 94 09:34:25 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
howland.reston.ans.net!news.moneng.mei.com!uwm.edu!caen!malgudi.oar.net!
wariat.org!mystis!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Have a say about ARRL policy
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

hlester@helium.gas.uug.arizona.edu (howard n lester) writes:

> In article <1994Feb28.230819.12135@arrl.org>,
> Ed Hare (KA1CV) <ehare@arrl.org> wrote:
> >You can also usually find your Division Director at most major hamfests
>
> How much do they usually sell for?
>
> :)
>
Do you really want us to tell you what they are WORTH?

:-)

--

"We are all now safe from crime. The Brady 'Law' has taken effect.
All can sleep peacefully knowing our paternalistic government will
take care and protect us! Of course I also believe in Santa Claus,
The Easter Bunny, The Tooth Fairy and The Great Pumpkin!"

Date: Thu, 3 Mar 1994 06:13:58 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!ucsnews!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!
dog.ee.lbl.gov!newshub.nosc.mil!news!Roger.Keating@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: IMPORTANT - June VHF QSO Party
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Scott, I share your dissatisfaction that the date changed, but I'm not
sure that it should be moved back to the other date for 1994. Some of
us have already made our plans for this year's contest for the date
stated now.

It would have been better if the National Convention hadn't been
scheduled when it was, but if one had to move, the contest probably was
the easier don't you think? I intend to participate in both the
convention and the contest.

Roger Keating - KD6EFQ
keating@nosc.mil

Date: 25 Feb 94 23:19:06 GMT
From: nprdc!ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!think.com!cass.ma02.bull.com!syd.bull.oz.au!
brahman!tmx!news.cs.su.oz.au!metro!ipso!rwc@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: IPS Daily Report 25 02 94
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

IPS RADIO AND SPACE SERVICES AUSTRALIA
Daily Solar And Geophysical Report
Issued at 2330 UT 25 February 1994
Summary for 25 February and Forecast up to 28 February
No IPS Warning is current.

1A. SOLAR SUMMARY
Activity: low

Flares: none.

Observed 10.7 cm flux/Equivalent Sunspot Number : 097/044

1B. SOLAR FORECAST

	26 February	27 February	28 February
Activity	Low	Low	Low
Fadeouts	None expected	None expected	None expected

Forecast 10.7 cm flux/Equivalent Sunspot Number : 095/041

1C. SOLAR C002ENT

None.

2A. MAGNETIC SU02ARY

Geomagnetic field at Learmonth : quiet to unsettled

Estimated Indices : A	K	Observed A Index 24 February
Learmonth	10 2233 2322	
Fredericksburg	12	03
Planetary	12	05

2B. MAGNETIC FORECAST

DATE	Ap	CONDITIONS
26 Feb	10	Quiet to unsettled.
27 Feb	10	Quiet to unsettled.
28 Feb	10	Quiet to unsettled.

2C. MAGNETIC C002ENT

None.

3A. GLOBAL HF PROPAGATION SU02ARY

DATE	LATITUDE BAND	MI25LE	HIGH
25 Feb	LOW normal	normal	fair-normal

PCA Event : None.

3B. GLOBAL HF PROPAGATION FORECAST

DATE	LATITUDE BAND	MI25LE	HIGH
26 Feb	LOW normal	normal	fair
27 Feb	LOW normal	normal	fair
28 Feb	LOW normal	normal	fair

3C. GLOBAL HF PROPAGATION C002ENT

NONE.

4A. AUSTRALIAN REGION IONOSPHERIC SU02ARY

MUFs at Sydney were 10 to 20% above predicted monthly values

T index: 71

4B. AUSTRALIAN REGION IONOSPHERIC FORECAST

DATE	T-index	MUFs
26 Feb	60	About 15% above predicted monthly values.
27 Feb	60	About 15% above predicted monthly values.
28 Feb	60	About 15% above predicted monthly values.

Predicted Monthly T Index for February is 30.

4C. AUSTRALIAN REGION C002ENT

None.

--

IPS Regional Warning Centre, Sydney	IPS Radio and Space Services
email: rwc@ips.oz.au	PO Box 5606
tel: +61 2 4148329	West Chatswood NSW 2057
fax: +61 2 4148331	AUSTRALIA

Date: 27 Feb 94 05:06:20 GMT
From: raven.alaska.edu!aurora.alaska.edu!fsrla@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: MAC/WEFAX?????????
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Could someone please send me info
on how to set my Mac up for WEFAX.
What do I need (programs, hardware,
radio-stuff)? Where would I go
about getting these things?

Thanks!!!!!!

FSRLA@AURORA.ALASKA.EDU
Roger Asbury WL7NT

Date: Thu, 3 Mar 1994 07:00:40 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!mvb.saic.com!news.cerf.net!usc!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!
srgenprp!glenne@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Medium range point-to-point digital links
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Jon Bloom (KE3Z) (jbbloom@arrl.org) wrote:
: If 20% of hams are using packet as their primary mode when (for the

: vast majority of them) the support consists of poorly engineered
: 1200-baud links and 300-baud HF links, doesn't it make sense that
: at *least* that 20% would find 56-kbit/s useful? Understand, I'm

And what kind of performance do you anticipate each will see from this backbone if it is truly nationwide? My guess is that it will be worse than what they see now. What fraction of this 56kbps which is going everywhere will a given user likely get? Will it be enough to cause him to want to support it for what it can do for him?

I'm not knocking making 56kbps hardware a part of a network any more than I'm suggesting current 1200 bps users should stop what they are enjoying. I am questioning whether this is enough to be viable.

: faster the better, within reasonable economic limits. But "fast
: enough" is a relative term. It depends on the amount of data you
: want to send and the response times you require. And it's like

I agree. It's never "enough". The measure though is not what you or I think but what the "market" will bear. Right now that is a fairly rapidly moving target.

: If you are going to insist that a 56-kbit/s network isn't useful,
: what are the usage assumptions you are starting from? I bet I

I definitely didn't say it wouldn't be useful. I just said that I don't see how it will be enough to support itself. Actually one of the "uses" of it is already happening; it's getting at least a few people talking about a national amateur network from a system viewpoint including many of the layers. I don't know that this has happened as much since the early 1900's when W1AW himself was around. Perhaps it has.

: can develop a (practical) set of usage assumptions that show
: *your* proposed network to be unacceptably limited.

I haven't yet proposed a network. I'm not even sure that US amateurs can/will join to support any suitable network. I have asked for an estimate of how a 56kbps network could be viable.

: I'm not saying I don't agree that a higher speed network is desirable.
: I'm just saying that the utility of the network vs. the speed
: is purely a matter of degree, and rests on opinions about what
: represents usable network capacity, not on hard data.

I agree and I hope I'm wrong about what it will take to build something of sufficient utility to be self-supporting within the hobby in the long term when it is compared to the competing information age diversions which are becoming available.

: By the way... where can I buy my Hubmaster system? I *know* where
: I can get the 56-kbaud hardware.

Hubmaster is a protocol, not a set of hardware. You can implement it
yourself at 1200 bps if you want. In some situations, doing so might even
improve per-user throughput and reduce latencies.

Glenn Elmore n6gn

ax.25 n6gn@wx3k.#nocal.ca.usa.na
amateur IP: glenn@SantaRosa.ampr.org
Internet: glenne@sr.hp.com

Date: 25 Feb 94 21:00:35 GMT
From: nprdc!ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!pitstop.mcd.mot.com!
mcdphx!schbbs!waters.corp.mot.com.corp.mot.com!user@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Nude Radio Amateurs
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <2kl23t\$bts@clarknet.clark.net>, andy@clark.net (Andrew M. Cohn)
wrote:

> Julian Macassey (julian@bongo.tele.com) wrote:
>
>
> : I belong to a group with higher purposes. We would never
> : transmit naked. Furthermore, we would never send QSL cards depicting
> : members in the buff.
>
> We who are members of the Formal Amateur Radio Ham Team (FARHT) know
> about your group, Julian, and we do not consider you well dressed at all.
> Here at FARHT, we wear tuxes while operating; during contests we add top
> hats, tails and gloves. (The top hats add the capacitance necessary to
> work the really big ones; the tails make a great counterpoise.

As a result the tales get to be very tall and the B***S*** gets very deep
:-)

Date: 25 Feb 94 20:58:31 GMT
From: nprdc!ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!pitstop.mcd.mot.com!
mcdphx!schbbs!waters.corp.mot.com.corp.mot.com!user@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: On-line Repeater Directory

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <jfhCLsBMn.7nJ@netcom.com>, jfh@netcom.com (Jack Hamilton) wrote:

> marcbg@netcom.com (Marc B. Grant) wrote:

>

> >SO it's not like the ARRL is protecting something very sacred, it's
> >just that they have alot of man-hours involved in the repeater directory
> >project, and if there's anyone that can't understand why they don't want
> >to give the information away, well, then, I guess you just don't
> >understand business.

>

> The ARRL isn't a for-profit organization, and its purpose isn't to make
> money. They provide many free services, such as the reciprocal operating
> information, the file server, etc. They also distribute the net directory
> in electronic form. There may be good reasons for keeping the repeater
> directory under their control, but "we have to make money off of it" isn't
> one of them.

It seems you don't understand the contradiction in the above paragraph.

"not for profit" does not mean "doesn't handle money"!

ARRL has various sources of income, dues (from those of you that aren't life members :-), sale of publications etc. One of those sources is the repeater directory.

Every one of those income sources must go to services or support of some kind or thou show a profit, but on the other hand the money for those services and support has to come from somewhere!

In other words "we have to make money off it" is a perfectly valid reason, especially considering the man-years of effort that went into creating the publication in the first place!

Date: Thu, 3 Mar 1994 06:26:06 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!newshub.nosc.mil!news!
Roger.Keating@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Yaesu FT2400H - Great radio.
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

My Yaesu FT2400H is my favorite radio to use. It has been outstanding at keeping high-power pagers in the area out of my audio and the design has

some nice features for useability. I love the light in the microphone and the alphanumerics. Easy to access the power settings and other adjustable pots in the top of the rig.

Worst feature: slow response on the tone-decode option. Mine takes about 300msec I estimate and that seems way too slow. Some of the functions are hard to figure out without the manual, but this is probably the *only* radio with that drawback... :)

If they made one of these for any other band besides 440, I'd buy it right away. I won't ever sell this radio. I hear rumors this radio is to be discontinued; why, I'll never figure out. Sales may not be great enough in the USA. I heard a rumor that Yaesu sells more of this radio in Belize than in all of USA; they use them for car phones there.

Roger Keating - KD6EFQ

Date: Thu, 3 Mar 1994 05:57:41 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!ucsnews!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!
europa.eng.gtefsd.com!library.ucla.edu!news.ucdavis.edu!chip.ucdavis.edu!
ez006683@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1994Mar2.144907.26098@bongo.tele.com>, <CM2960.93I@ucdavis.edu>,
<2l3nuj\$pr@bigfoot.wustl.edu>
Subject : Re: JARGON

Jesse L Wei (jlw3@cec3.wustl.edu) wrote:

: Now this is my question: do hams *ever* talk about anything besides what
: kind of rig (s)he's got, ham problems, ham equipment, etc? As a waiting
: (as in for my ticket) prospective, I've listened to the local repeaters,
: and personally, the conversations seem pretty boring if that's all you
: ever talk about. Have I missed anything? or something? Is the purpose
: of ham radio to talk about the technicalities of it? I know that the
: whole nature of it requires technicality, but isn't there more to
: it than that?

Yes, Their latest surgery and their DX count but you'll have to pass the 13wpm code exam. If you can pass a 5wpm exam you can talk about crummy sun spot numbers and 10X10 numbers instead.

: --jesse (still waiting)

Just like the energizer bunny... you keeep waiting and waiting... and waiting. Hang in there.

cheers,
Dan

```
--
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@KE6LW.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                      Internet: ddtodd@ucdavis.edu            *
*                      Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102           *
*                      Davis CA 95616                         *
*-----*
* All opinions expressed herein are completely fictitious any *
* resemblance to actual opinions of persons living or dead is  *
* completely coincidental.                                     *
*-----*
```

Date: Thu, 3 Mar 1994 18:50:52 GMT
From: oracle!unreliable!bounce@decwrl.dec.com
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <kmeyer.3b0x@bbs.xnet.com>, <1994Mar2.175938.12119@alw.nih.gov>,
<1994Mar3.144159.3607@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>1
Subject : Re: Further criminalization of scanning

In article <1994Mar3.144159.3607@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

-- Other Quote Deleted --

>
>I agree, both with the idea that government is too quick to say "there
>ought to be a law" and that scanner hobbieists are at heart voyeurs. That's
>where the basic difficulty arises. Laws against Peeping Toms have existed
>for centuries. Congress is trying to extend that principle into the wireless
>age, but they're making the same mistake here as they are with the problem
>of violence in society. Banning scanners will be no more effective than
>banning guns, and has the undesirable side effect of causing unnecessary
>harm to legitimate users of these tools. The real problem in both cases
>is sick and twisted individuals with no sense of morals or ethics, not
>the hardware that enables them to pursue their voyeurism or violence.

>
>Gary
>--

>Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
>Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
>534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
>Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

How many people were killed by scanner last year?

Doug :~}

. Douglas E. Marsh				Oracle Consulting .
. (513) 629-2229 V-Mail				312 Elm Street .
. (513) 651-4444 Office		Your Message Here		Suite 1525 .
. (513) 651-4463 Fax				Cincinnati, OH 45202 .
.				.
. InterNet Address				Amateur Radio Call Sign.
. dmarsh@oracle.com		Too much is never enough.		N8TUT .

Date: 2 Mar 1994 22:51:40 -0800

From: nntp.crl.com!crl.crl.com!not-for-mail@decwrl.dec.com

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <gradyCLsKtB.I3r@netcom.com>, <kmeyer.3b0x@bbs.xnet.com>,

<1994Mar2.175938.12119@alw.nih.gov>swr

Subject : Re: Further criminalization of scanning

Neil Weisenfeld (weisen@alw.nih.gov) wrote:

: I agree that the laws stink, but why does everyone always go for the big
: conspiracy theory? I seriously doubt that the FBI and FCC are trying to
: "drive scanner manufacturers out of business". I also doubt that the FCC
: cares what you listen to. The ECPA is an act of Congress, not FCC.

I agree. I don't even think Congress cares what I listen to. The problem
is whether we care who Congress listens to.

: What I think we should do is write to our congresspeople and tell them why
: we feel the cellular and cordless privacy laws are so misguided.

Even if as many as I optimistically hoped would, did, I wonder if it would
do any good. Congress seems so much more responsive to larger interests.
Besides, the hobby has a stigma in the eyes of some who feel it is not a
proper hobby for a gentleman. They see us as deviants, huddled in our
closets, eating dogfood out of a can as we eavesdrop on our neighbors.

: Even if

: they outlaw the manufacture of scanners that can receive cordless
: (and I haven't heard anyone say that that is what is up for debate --
: only outlawing *listening*, not manufacture), those radios are going to be
: around for a long, long time as used equipment. The effects of the law
: will be to a) *not* severely restrict the availability of cordless-capable
: scanners and b) give the public a false sense of security.

Paradoxical results to passed laws are not that uncommon. Some would say such results have ensued from gun control laws, drug laws or even the old semi-conductor agreement with Japan. (This is the beauty of the system.)

: Rather than thickening the law books, the government should educate the
: public about what is going on.

Yes, I agree. But I don't think our government is about problem-solving; it's about pandering.

: All the law is
: going to do is damage the lives of the very few people who get caught and
: damage the lives of the many who blab all sorts of confidential information
: on their cordless phones.

Apparently a price worth paying to feel the problem has been handled and we can go on with our lives.

David Eitelbach

--

"The whole aim of practical politics is to keep the populace alarmed (and hence clamorous to be led to safety) by menacing it with an endless series of hobgoblins, all of them imaginary."

-- H. L. Mencken

Date: 3 Mar 1994 19:26:23 GMT

From: news.acns.nwu.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!
news.Brown.EDU!NewsWatcher!user@network.ucsd.edu

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <9402281434.AA12050@umassmed.UMMED.EDU>,

<rohvm1.mah48d-010394075503@136.141.220.39>, <tcjCM2nKv.28C@netcom.com>

Subject : Re: The ARRL is a business (was "Re: ARRL--->Online Repeater directory")

In article <tcjCM2nKv.28C@netcom.com>, tcj@netcom.com (Todd Jonz) wrote:

> Stephen Baker (sbaker@umassmed.UMMED.EDU) writes:

>
> > The league publishes the repeater directory which it currently
> > enjoys monopoly status. This must be enormously profitable for them
> > as they are the sole source for such a directory
>
> John E. Taylor III (rohvm1.mah48d@rohmmaas.com) replies:
>
> > Enormously profitable? I don't think the League makes a _bundle_ on
> > anything. They _are_ a business, though. As others have pointed
> > out, non-profit does not mean that you can't _make_ money, it just
> > governs what you _do_ with the money you make.

It is profitable for the executives of the corporation. That's right, why do you think some of these guys have made a career out of the ARRL? Not because of their love of amateur radio but because of their love of power and money. Very simple.

> A league official recently told me that the ARRL spends an average of \$75 per
> year per member. If I'm not mistaken, membership costs only \$40. That extra
> \$35 per capita has to come from somewhere.

Actually, I'll have to go over the annual report I have for the ARRL more closely.

> As John very correctly points out, being a non-profit organization and
> generating revenue are not mutually exclusive. Although I'm neither a tax
> lawyer nor an accountant, my understanding is that, excluding an allowed
> accrual for operating expenses, a non-profit organization's income and
> expenses must balance to zero at the end of its fiscal year.

Actually you're pretty much correct but you can roll some of your non-profit dollars into other tax periods.

Tony

--

== Anthony_Pelliccio@Brown.edu (Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR)
== Box 1908, Providence, RI 02912 Tel. (401) 863-1880
== All opinions expressed are those of the individual, and not those
== of Brown University.

Date: 3 Mar 1994 07:25:04 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde@gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!wupost!
bigfoot.wustl.edu!cec3!j1w3@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <CM2960.93I@ucdavis.edu>, <2l3nuj\$pr@bigfoot.wustl.edu>,
<CM2r85.1IF@ucdavis.edu>
Subject : Re: JARGON

Daniel D. Todd (ez006683@chip.ucdavis.edu) wrote:

: Jesse L Wei (jlw3@cec3.wustl.edu) wrote:

: : Now this is my question: do hams *ever* talk about anything besides what
: : kind of rig (s)he's got, ham problems, ham equipment, etc? As a waiting
: : (as in for my ticket) prospective, I've listened to the local repeaters,
: : and personally, the conversations seem pretty boring if that's all you
: : ever talk about. Have I missed anything? or something? Is the purpose
: : of ham radio to talk about the technicalities of it? I know that the
: : whole nature of it requires technicality, but isn't there more to
: : it than that?

: Yes, Their latest surgery and their DX count but you'll have to pass the
: 13wpm code exam. If you can pass a 5wpm exam you can talk about crummy
: sun spot numbers and 10X10 numbers instead.

Well, I passed the 5 wpm code, and my code is now up to 13 wpm. Kind of
ironic that I've worked up to general (haven't taken the theory or code
tests yet, but will once school gets out for the semester) from tech plus,
and I've not even received my license for tech plus. If things keep up,
I'll be up to advanced soon. The question will be whether or not I'll
have had any air time by then. I'm just wondering (as the main subject
of my previous post) just what exactly i'm waiting for.

: : --jesse (still waiting)

: Just like the energizer bunny... you keeep waiting and waiting... and
: waiting. Hang in there.

yup, that's me. . .

--jesse

End of Info-Hams Digest V94 #233

